

MAY 8 2022 1:36 PM ZULF RUMINATES ON THE ROUSSEAU HYPOTHESIS

ZULFIKAR MOINUDDIN AHMED
ZULFIKAR.AHMED@GMAIL.COM

Jean-Jacques Rousseau's influential model of human nature had a strong influence on Romantic Era philosophy to the modern notions of personhood. Rousseau thought that human beings were fundamentally good corrupted by society.

I want to promote a new canonical notion of human nature, that moral goodness is roughly 95% probability for human beings, and moral badness is roughly 5%. I would like to remove from the consideration whether *society* is the corrupting force for the 5%. There is a Rousseau exponential in human moral values with weight of roughly 95% and a complementary *Hobbes exponential* of roughly 5%. This allows us to have a precise view to understand a *hazard rate* for the Hobbes exponential. Reasonable explanations might be due to developmental problems, whether due to societal factors or not for the failure of moral goodness at the individual level.

I want to put this in the context of the Romantic Era conception of human beings because this is the source of the modern self, and we would like to produce a massive correction to the modern self that is in line with actual truth of science.

In a sense both Sigmund Freud and Aristotle were wrong in that I have shown the existence of universal human moral nature and there are enormous amount of *evolutionary adaptations* that allow human beings to have a moral nature. My way of thinking is that human beings are moral by nature and this is where Rousseau is right. I want to make my viewpoint the canonical scientific viewpoint for the entire age.

We are born with an enormous amount of apparatus to be morally good. Habituation to virtues is a refinement and internalisation phase that can fail however.

Jonathan Haidt and Joshua Greene have worked on moral intuition [5]. What is clear to me is that the moral virtues are developed by repetition via the habit system of the basal ganglia, and this is why moral intuition does not involve cognitive judgment.

I was listening to a talk by Joshua Greene where he brought to light the political differences about moral choices in the United States. My concern is more fundamental and is universal and not special to the United States. The question that interests me is the universal human moral nature rather than idiosyncratic differences of political divisions. It is in this universal scale where I see strong answers that are universally valid.

1. IS MORALITY ABOUT COOPERATION?

Joshua Greene sees morality as a cooperation device, and that can be considered a Consequentialist viewpoint. I am personally much more invested in the Virtue

Ethics tradition, and not the Consequentialist tradition which had been quite popular since John Stuart Mill and the utilitarian consequentialism. My viewpoint comes from a pure scientific view of individual moral nature which involves both genetic endowment and individual moral evolution. I believe virtue ethics is more fundamental to produce a statistical scientific view of moral diversity of opinions.

I would like to publish some of my work and ideas, and thought that Philosophical Review might be a good platform.

The scientific weaknesses of both Deontology and Consequentialism that I bring out have not been widely appreciated. Only Virtue Ethics can produce a legitimate scientific theory of morality.

2. CLEAR EXAMPLE OF NEED FOR RETRIBUTION

Bill Gates malevolently invaded my personal meta, mauled my finance, career, and finance meta, starved me of all legitimate income transgressing all rules of power, and is plotting a dystopian world with natural rights denied to nonwhites. This is the sort of thing that is not particularly controversial. He is a malevolent actor and deserves to be put to death and have all his assets confiscated and businesses suspended in the United States. This is the sort of example that needs to be reviewed on abstract debates about whether retribution is valid. It is not often valid but exists because of clear cut cases like Bill Gates and inappropriate use of power.

The case of Bill Gates is perhaps the most important example for the entire world discussion of *necessity of punishment*. We want to punish people like Bill Gates because they are purely malevolent beings who are guaranteed to cause human race grave harm if unpunished. The issue is not rehabilitation. He intentionally deceived the world about his liberal opinions. In reality all his public pronouncements throughout his life had been duplicitous "PR" which he believes to be deliberate lies always. This sort of malevolent agent will always require pure punishment despite their wealth.

3. I DESERVE A NOBEL PRIZE FOR SEVERAL ADVANCEMENTS

The resolution of the fantastically difficult protein folding problem will lead to advances in medicine that alone is worth a Nobel Prize but I deserve a Nobel Prize for discovery of a universal human moral nature that will affect all political and social endeavours on Earth for centuries. This is a dramatic transformation of Western Intellectual Tradition this discovery.

4. POVERTY OF SELF-BUILDING IN 2022

When I read M. H. Abrams' interpretation of the Romantics' projects of self-building, it is quite clear to me that the contemporary moment has a clear poverty of self-building that is indicative of a tiredness of the current age that does not have any canonical path to self-development that displaces that of the English, French and German efforts of the Romantic period and thus suffers from a collapse of the self to mere commercial laws.

5. AM I CLOSER TO ENLIGHTENMENT OR ROMANTICISM?

I am Zulfikar Moinuddin Ahmed, now 48, living at the moment in Allen Texas, not my preferred place of residence, without the sort of income that I think I am naturally due given my Princeton magna cum laude in 1995 and my industry experience. I have been quite concerned with Enlightenment and Romanticism, trying to understand myself and my place in the modern world. I believe my various contributions deserve Nobel Prizes but I don't even have a good job at the moment. I was listening to a fascinating lecture on Emerson and Nietzsche as paragons of Enlightenment and Romanticism [6]. I, being a strong devotee of Percy Bysshe Shelley, had thought that I was more influenced by Romanticism than Enlightenment, but the balance and reconciliation between the tendencies is personally important to me.

This lecture is most interesting for me because it touches upon some of the key principles that had organised my own trajectory. After a great deal of soul-searching I had decided that maximal life satisfaction for eight billion is an intrinsic good. This did not occur to me in the abstract, as it had for utilitarian philosophers but by examining empirical measurements of life satisfaction and the factors that affect them. It would be quite reasonable to consider this particular viewpoint an Enlightenment viewpoint. Now I am interested in understanding the consideration of this goal as an *individual passion* being Romanticist without constraints. Romanticism's focus on individual light shining forth does not penalise against the goals being compatible with Enlightenment.

Isiah Berlin had definitions for *contrasting terms* Enlightenment and Romanticism. I will admit before moving on that I am not a Romantic in the sense that unbridled passion is a good-in-itself. I doubt that this was Shelley's ideas about Romanticism and to me this seems a caricature of the entire movement.

Isiah Berlin's notion of Romanticism in terms of fear and paranoia of other people who must be exterminated is unfair and wrong. I don't respect this definition of Romanticism at all. This is an extremely pathological condition that I do not believe ever permeated the Romantics of Shelley's ilk.

Romantics, by and large, and especially P. B. Shelley, was extremely concerned with moral elevation of Man, and the view of Isiah Berlin from 1965 cannot be sustained as a reasonable view of Romanticism.

I am very interested in both Ralph Waldo Emerson and Friedrich Nietzsche, and am quite mesmerised by their joint influence on Robert Musil, who was a scientific man like myself, who wrote *The Man Without Qualities* that stands as a challenge to me since I am quite convinced of the value of classical virtues for life satisfaction. Nietzsche was quite negative in his outlook compared to Shelley, and I am surprised that he is considered the paradigm of Romanticism. He was influenced, but was not a paragon of Romanticism.

I am Romantic but I do not adhere to the Nietzschean notion of value-creation as I believe that Martin Seligman's 24 Virtues are sufficiently general to encompass, quite generally, the positive values that matter for human beings. Of course a million shades of grays will appear, but I do not see them as refuting the 24 Virtues of Seligman.

6. A NEW ATTEMPT TO GAIN THE TRUST OF THE HARVARD BOARD

Aristotle had some taxonomy and analysis for rhetoric, and I am not a master at all of rhetoric. First of all, I will use *familiarity* as a way to gain some trust of the Harvard Board of Directors. I am seeking tenure and I am seeking funding to do some of my projects in order \$100 million from them. The first order of familiarity will be an introduction to who I am, completely honestly. I am a Princeton graduate from 1995. Before that I was valedictorian of John Adams High School in New York. I was a third prize winner of Westinghouse Science talent search. I graduated magna with a prize for the most original senior thesis in Mathematics at Princeton. My mathematical skills are good and I have completed a large number of Stanford Mathematics Analysis Quals in the past year that show my mathematical caliber. I did not study psychology at Princeton and Psychology is a matter of self study. I have professional experience in proteomic bioinformatics, in coding technology and in Finance. I want to be quite clear that my record on these things is quite strong and that ought to give some familiarity to the Harvard Board, since I am like many Harvard graduates as well. I have never failed to uphold any portion of the Princeton Honour Code and my character metrics are measured. Since I do not know the Harvard Board Members personally I think this basic synopsis will give them some comfort in knowing who I am.

I have some great discoveries to my name from the past decade when I was not formally working with any institution. I make no effort to hide the fact that I was homeless for six months in 2008 and my major effort in the decade 2008-2018 had been to work independently on some questions of science. I have succeeded in these efforts.

I am seeking funding for new ideas. I want to develop quantitative positive psychology and prepare for management of world's life satisfaction by taking funding from Harvard Board and expanding two companies in Mission District San Francisco. I am not focusing on returns; I have ambitions of a different kind than straightforward commercial investment. I am doing this mostly as a global public service. I am under the impression that Harvard Board is sympathetic to this particular scenario.

I am a bit desperate because I don't have ordinary income and I need to recover from more than a decade without normal middle class income that ensued when I became homeless.

7. HOW TO MOVE PEOPLE I HAVE NEVER MET?

Not being a student of pragmatic rhetoric of persuasion, an interesting question is how can I move people I do not know personally and who do not know all my various charming personal qualities, and gain their trust. My approach is an honest attempt to express who I am and try to persuade them to see the world as I see it. I dislike cynicism because I feel that with the short life granted to us by Nature, cynicism is destructive of our deepest calling. My deepest calling is philosophical to a large extent. I have vindicated Aristotle's Virtue-Eudaimonia theory on empirical data and therefore can deduce that world's life satisfaction can be managed in principle, and I have worked for years in quantitative finance and therefore am familiar with the power of quantitative viewpoints to influence the world of human beings in mostly positive ways. I have professional experience with technology, and have been coding professionally in part from 1995, and I understand

the potential of technology to affect actual lives of billions with the explosion of internet and mobile around the globe. Therefore, I reasoned that quantitative positive psychology combined with communication and processing technology can eventually be used to improve life satisfaction uniformly for eight billion people.

Obviously there is a great deal of specific work that needs to occur. I am familiar with the difficulties that arise in work from experience in Finance, technology and biotechnology positions. It is my informed view that these hurdles are not insurmountable if we have some patience to develop companies that are well-adjusted and focused on the novel insights and has a passion for innivation.

These arguments along with my unique character and skills is my general rhetorical strategy to move people who do not know me personally. Intelligent well-informed people in all areas can understand my basic arguments and they stand on discoveries that I have made empirically without much resources.

REFERENCES

- [1] <https://github.com/zulf73/s4sim>
- [2] <https://github.com/zulf73/S4TheoryNotes>
- [3] <https://github.com/zulf73/moral-nature-virtues>
- [4] Ken Dill, S. Banu Ozkal, M. Scott Shell, and Thomas Weikl, The Protein Folding Problem, *Annu Rev Biophys.* 2008 June 9; 37: 289–316
- [5] Joshua Greene and Jonathan Haidt, How does moral judgment work?, *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 6 (12):517-523 (2002)
- [6] <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8wbcszqoDPs>